

I pause here to note that this is troubling. If true, this should be a warning to us about why we don't engage in corporate welfare. This is wrong. Deep down, we know it is wrong to take from the poor and give to the rich. We have no business doing this, nor do we have any business voting cloture on a motion to proceed to a bill that doesn't yet exist. We don't yet know what is in the bill because it is still being transformed significantly, even as we speak.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board continues:

The other claim for the bill is that the U.S. must subsidize domestic chipmaking to compete with China, but this also isn't persuasive. The companies like to point out that the U.S. share of the world's chips has fallen to 12 percent from 37 percent in 1990. They don't mention that the U.S. leads in chip design (52 percent) and chipmaking equipment (50 percent). Seven of the world's ten largest semiconductor companies are based in the U.S. China trails American companies by years in semiconductor technology.

Chip fabrication has moved to South Korea and Taiwan because many chips are commodities with low margins. But chip makers are working to diversify their manufacturing bases to avoid future supply disruptions and have announced \$80 billion in new U.S. investments through 2025. Samsung plans to build a \$17-billion factory in Texas. TSMC has a \$12-billion plant under construction in Arizona.

I pause here to note that in meeting with representatives from some of these companies, including TSMC, TSMC noted—in my conversations with high-ranking executives of that company—that plant isn't made contingent on any legislation they are producing. They are doing that because it makes good business sense, not because it is their last-gasp effort. This is a profitable company doing well, and for the United States to be considering giving money—whether to domestic companies or foreign ones—under these circumstances in this amount of money makes no sense.

The editorial continues:

One unfortunate impetus behind this bill is that, for all their talk about competing with China, many politicians believe that Beijing's economic planning is superior to the U.S. free market system. It reminds us of the 1980s when legendary Intel CEO Andrew Grove warned that Japan was going to dominate the chip industry and the future of global technology.

As former Cypress Semiconductor CEO T.J. Rodgers explained on these pages last year, the government set up the Sematech chip consortium that "was obsolescent when it opened." But Intel innovated with more advanced chips, and no one is talking now about Tokyo's central-planning genius.

The editorial concludes:

History shows that easy government money can undermine competitiveness. It often leads to inefficient spending and investment. The politicians will also attach their own strings, perhaps with limits on stock buybacks and dividends. Wait until Bernie Sanders is heard from on the Senate floor.

They forecasted what we have seen today. It closes with the following sentences:

The chip bill isn't needed to compete with China, and it will set a precedent that other

industries will follow. Anybody who can throw up a China competitive angle will ask for money. Why Republicans want to sign up for this is a mystery, especially when they might control both Houses of Congress in six months.

I couldn't agree more with the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal on this assessment. This is wrong. We know it is wrong. The bill still, as it stands right now, is unknown to most for the entirety of this body. We do know it costs over \$76 billion. We do know people across America, including poor people throughout the State of Utah—not just the poor, but most people—again, with inflation, during periods of inflation, the extremely wealthy can find ways to become even wealthier, but everyone else suffers—literally, everyone else. The poorer you are, the more you suffer. Even people well-entrenched in the middle class get gouged considerably. Why we would want to take money away from them and give it to the wealthy is beyond my ability to fathom.

All of this ties back to the reason I came to the floor today, which was to try to pass the PRICE Act by unanimous consent. We didn't succeed today, but we are not going away. We are going to keep undertaking this effort because the fact is, we do need to impose a supermajority requirement for spending, especially when spending levels are producing inflation in excess of 3 percent. We are at 9.1 percent nationally. And in many of our States, including my own, it is higher than that. That is why we need this.

My colleague pointed out he believes that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act may have contributed to that. Well, that is not exactly how things work. When you are passing a tax reform bill—a tax reform bill that makes downward adjustments to marginal income tax rates and to corporate rates and capital gains rates—yes, it brings in less revenue, but the government taking in less revenue doesn't cause inflation. It is deficit spending that causes inflation.

Given that it is deficit spending—particularly deficit spending during periods of inflation—that matters, I believe that is where we ought to be focused. We ought to be focused on pro-growth opportunities. And, frankly, if those adjustments to corporate rates, to capital gains rates, and to marginal tax rates are, in fact, pro-growth, they reduce disincentives to work, they bring more people back into the labor market, and that, in turn, produces more tax revenue.

You can expand, broaden the base, while lowering their rates and, ultimately, come out on top and with more robust economic growth. But what you can't do is engage in increasingly more aggressive deficit spending and expect that is going to do anything but harm the American people, especially America's poor and middle class.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me suggest to my friend from Utah that I agree with a lot of what he said about this legislation that we are going to be voting on within the hour.

I would simply add that while this bill has had many names—lately, they call it the chips bill; it has also been called the China bill and so forth—but theoretically, it is supposed to be competing against China.

But I would point out that since 2005, Intel has invested at least \$700 million in Chinese technology companies, including at least four microchip startups. In 2020, 2 years ago, Intel invested in two Chinese semiconductor startups, ProPlus and Spectrum Materials, as part of a \$132 million investment in 11 startups, including 3 in China. So we are investing, ostensibly to protect us from China, in a company that, in fact, invests in China.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, I am going to put forward a request for the Senate to confirm the nomination of Rebecca Jones Gaston to serve as Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families within the Department of Health and Human Services. I briefly want to talk about why her confirmation is so important and what makes her the right person for the job.

The Administration on Children, Youth, and Families may not grab national headlines every day, but its work is essential to the well-being of millions of young people and families across the land. That is particularly true for vulnerable children, including those in the child welfare system.

One of its big jobs over the last few years has been the implementation of the Family First Prevention Services Act. The landmark reform of the child welfare system was written by the Finance Committee on a bipartisan basis. And for colleagues who remember the late Orrin Hatch, who cared so much about children and particularly welfare reform, this and the extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program for 10 years—the longest extension ever—were the two bills for children that Chairman Hatch really felt strongly about.

The underlying goal of the legislation, which I was proud to cosponsor with him, was simple. The foster care system was breaking families up too often. We designed the Family First Act to keep families together whenever it was safe and possible to do so. Maybe a grandparent is the right person to step in as a caretaker for their grandkids. I have been particularly involved in having grandparents play a bigger role in our human services programs. It is known as kinship care. We have been working on it for well over a decade. Chairman Hatch helped us expand it. Maybe all that is needed for a

family to thrive is to help with mental healthcare for mom or dad. And with a little more flexibility in the program, a little more support, more families stay together and get ahead.

The underlying goal that Chairman Hatch and I had was simple, but implementation has certainly been a challenge. It has required a lot of close collaboration between the Department of Health and Human Services, the Finance Committee, and State and local agencies.

My view is, when you are talking about reforms dealing with the well-being of our youngest, particularly most vulnerable kids, it is just critical to get it right. That is why Rebecca Jones Gaston is the right person to lead the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families. She serves as the child welfare director for Oregon's Department of Human Services. She is showing herself to be an effective leader and a strong advocate for the vulnerable. She served in a similar role in the State of Maryland under a Republican Governor. So this is somebody who shows up every single day, willing to work with elected officials on both sides of the aisle. All in all, she brings nearly 25 years of experience in public policy dealing with support for families and children.

The Finance Committee approved her nomination on a bipartisan basis in March. My view is, the full Senate has waited long enough. Ms. Gaston is a highly qualified nominee, and the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families needs a confirmed leader.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 763, Rebecca E. Jones Gaston to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, since last year, I have been asking for a commitment from my Democrat colleagues that any future reconciliation legislation in this Congress will not incorporate policies that will reduce access to care in nonexpansion States such as Tennessee. Specifically, my concern is that this reconciliation legislation that the House of Representatives passed last fall included provisions that cut DSH and uncompensated care pool payments for nonexpansion States. This would result in less healthcare for vulnerable populations in my State, accelerate hospital closures in my State, and it would disadvantage rural communities in my State of Tennessee. These are places and populations for which we are try-

ing to secure more quality healthcare, not less.

Because I have not received confirmation that these provisions will not be included in any future reconciliation bill, I cannot consent to expediting confirmation of this nominee, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, just speaking briefly again, let me tell my colleague from Tennessee that I have very much enjoyed working with him on various policies here in the Senate.

My understanding is that my colleague believes that his State has some ideas for showing that you can essentially meet Medicaid standards for health services for vulnerable people and that the State of Tennessee is interested in trying out some new approaches. I want to assure my colleague that we are interested in hearing more about this. There is a specific waiver provision, for example, in the Affordable Care Act to try out new approaches consistent with these guardrails so that people actually get healthcare coverage. My colleague has said to me that he is interested in pursuing those kinds of ideas. I want him to know that the Finance Democratic staff is available to hear his staff out on this, and I hope we can work it out, and I hope we can move Rebecca Gaston quickly.

This is a program that really makes a difference. Prior to Chairman Hatch working with me on this, we had essentially two alternatives for these vulnerable kids, neither of them particularly valuable. One was just sending the kids off to foster care—some of those facilities are good; some of them, not so good—or keeping them at home in a less than desirable situation. What we did on a bipartisan basis is find a third path for these vulnerable youngsters, where, for example, if a parent was having difficulty with alcohol or drugs, they could get treatment and stay as the parent.

So this is an important program. Rebecca Gaston knows how to run it well. I want to see her confirmed as quickly as possible, and I want to tell my colleague I recognize his concern today and will be interested in following up with him and his staff to hear more about the program in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE  
CALENDAR

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today, I rise in support of the nomination of Rita Landgraf for the position of Assistant Secretary for Aging and Administrator of the Administration for Community Living at the Department of Health and Human Services. I have been privileged to know Rita Landgraf for over two decades and to have worked with her when I was Governor of Delaware and in the years since then.

She is a longtime Delaware community leader who previously served as cabinet secretary of the Delaware Department of Health and Social Services, which may be the most challenging job of any cabinet secretary in the State government of Delaware. There, she oversaw State implementation of the Older Americans Act, Medicaid, home- and community-based services, and disability services as well. She also had leadership roles with the State offices of AARP, the ARC, and the National Alliance on Mental Illness, which are key national partners for initiatives within the Administration for Community Living.

Rita's career has been inspired by her relationships with the elderly and those with disabilities, including her stepson. In addition to her extensive expertise, she will bring a personal passion to her work as Assistant Secretary. Rita's experience in leading organizations focused on advocating for people with disabilities and seniors, along with her time in State government, makes her an excellent—an excellent—choice to serve as Assistant Secretary of Aging. I applaud President Biden for nominating her to serve in this role.

The Administration for Community Living does critically important work ensuring older Americans of all ages with disabilities are able to live where they choose, with the people they choose, and with the ability to participate fully in their communities. The Administration for Community Living works through community-based organizations and invests in research, education, and innovation that help make this priority a reality for millions of older Americans and people with disabilities.

Rita Landgraf is the right person for this job. As secretary of Delaware's Department of Health and Social Services, Rita Landgraf successfully led one of the State's largest cabinet agencies and expanded community-based services aimed at helping older Americans age in place and people with disabilities live, work, and participate in their communities—exactly the type of work the Administration for Community Living supports.

Rita is a powerful advocate and a convener of stakeholders and partners. She will bring partners together to further the mission of the Administration for Community Living and bring new and innovative insight to address priorities on aging that we can all agree upon.

Rita wants older Americans to age in place. She believes in the strength and value of home- and community-based services for both the elderly and the disabled, especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. For Americans with mental health and special needs, Rita Landgraf has prioritized keeping folks in their homes and expanding employment opportunities for them—steps we can take to ensure that these vulnerable populations can be full participants in their communities.